

Message

From: Sullivan, Suzanne (USAMA) [Suzanne.Sullivan@usdoj.gov]
Sent: 10/1/2009 2:58:55 PM
To: Khan, Annie (DPH) [Annie.Khan@state.ma.us]
Subject: FW: [REDACTED]

Annie,

Not sure if Lisa is in today so I thought I'd also email you. Can you read the emails below and let me know what you think?

Thanks.

Suzanne

From: Sullivan, Suzanne (USAMA)
Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2009 9:32 AM
To: 'Glazer, Lisa (DPH)'
Subject: FW: [REDACTED]

Lisa,

Relative to the [REDACTED] case that is set for trial on 10/13, it appears it may be a plea.

However, the defense counsel has a question relative to the original submission and the re-submission of the cocaine for retesting and the drug receipts for the two. (See below.) Can you let me know why the gross weights differ from the drug receipt reflecting the submission on 1/15/09 versus the drug receipt reflecting the re-submission on 2/18/09?

Thanks,

Suzanne

From: Michael Liston [mailto:m.liston@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2009 6:56 PM
To: Sullivan, Suzanne (USAMA)
Subject: [REDACTED]

Suzanne;

I have spoken with [REDACTED] and gave him the high points of the plea agreement. He is on board.

I am, however, curious about the documents reflecting the delivery and testing of the crack samples. As I am sure you have noticed, there appear to be retests with differing gross weights. See for example document 298 and 299. Apparently the initial tests simply identified cocaine and were resubmitted to test for base -- but why do the gross weights differ? Can you give me an explanation? I am not looking for a way out, I m just trying to avoid ineffective assistance of counsel.

Mike

_____ Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 4471 (20090930)

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>